

REMARKS

Claims Presented

With this Response to Office Action, the following claims are presented:

<u>Claims</u>	<u>Status</u>
1, 11 and 21	currently amended
2, 7-8, 14, 16, 22, 28-29, 31 and 33-34	previously presented
3-6, 12-13, 23-26, 30 and 32	original
9-10, 15 and 27	canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer
17-20	withdrawn, without prejudice or disclaimer

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

§ 102 Rejections

Office Action page 2, ¶ 2, rejected claims 1, 3, 7-21 and 26-34 on 35 U.S.C. § 102 grounds, as allegedly anticipated by **Sugiarto** et al. (US 6,278,449 B1). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Unclear Rejections

Office Action page 8, 1st full ¶, begins “As per claim 30, Diwan discloses ... as in claim 29, ...”. Given that claim 29 was rejected on 35 U.S.C. § 102 grounds as allegedly anticipated by **Sugiarto**, Applicant believes this is, at best, properly characterized as a rejection on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) grounds, as allegedly obvious over the combination of **Sugiarto** and **Diwan**. Applicant respectfully traverses.

To be anticipated, a claim must have each and every element disclosed in the cited document, with each and every component coupled identically as recited in the text of the claim. It is not possible for a claim to be anticipated over a pair of cited documents. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant respectfully further requests this rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully requests clarification from the Office regarding the nature of this rejection. Applicant specifically requests that in view of the unclarity of the rejection and the new grounds of rejection, it would be manifestly unfair for any rejection to be made final until the nature of the rejection is clarified and that Applicant has an opportunity to review and respond to that clarification. If the Office disagrees, or if Applicant is in any way misreading the nature of the rejection, Applicant respectfully requests a response to that effect as soon as practical, so that an appropriate petition may follow.

Office Action page 8, 2nd full ¶, begins “As per claim 31, Diwan discloses ... as in Claim 29, ...”. Applicant respectfully traverses for similar reasons as its traverse of the rejection of claim 30, respectfully further requests this rejection be withdrawn, and respectfully requests a similar remedy.

Office Action page 8, 3rd full ¶, begins “As per claim 32, Diwan discloses ... as in Claim 31, ...”. Applicant respectfully traverses for similar reasons as its traverse of the rejection of claims 29-30, respectfully further requests this rejection be withdrawn, and respectfully requests a similar remedy.

Office Action page 9, 1st ¶, begins “As per claim 33, Diwan disclose[s] ... as in claim 1, wherein ...”. Given that claim 1 was rejected on 35 U.S.C. § 102 grounds as allegedly anticipated by **Sugiarto**, Applicant believes this is, at best, properly characterized as a rejection on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) grounds, as allegedly obvious over the combination of **Sugiarto** and **Diwan**. Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant respectfully further traverses for similar reasons as its traverse of the rejection of claims 29-32, respectfully further requests this rejection be withdrawn, and respectfully requests a similar remedy.

Office Action page 9, 2nd ¶, begins “As per claim 34, Diwan disclose[s] ... as in claim 1, wherein ...”. Given that claim 1 was rejected on 35 U.S.C. § 102 grounds as allegedly anticipated by **Sugiarto**, Applicant believes this is properly characterized as a rejection on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) grounds, as allegedly obvious over the combination of **Sugiarto** and **Diwan**. Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant respectfully further requests this rejection be with-

drawn. Applicant respectfully further traverses for similar reasons as its traverse of the rejection of claims 29-32, respectfully further requests this rejection be withdrawn, and respectfully requests a similar remedy.

§ 103 Rejections

Office Action page 9, ¶ 3, rejects claim 2 on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) grounds as allegedly being “unpatentable over” [**Sugiarto**] “in view of” **Katariya** et al. (US 2002/0091789). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Office Action page 10, ¶ 4, rejects claims 4-6 and 23-25 on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) grounds as allegedly being “unpatentable over” [**Sugiarto**] “in view of” **Feinleib** (US 6,272,532 B1). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Remarks with respect to these rejections appear below. Reconsideration and withdrawal of each and every one of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Summary of Rejections

For convenience, the following table summarizes the art rejections made by the Office Action. As noted above, Applicant traverses each and every one of these rejections.

/ / /

<u>Claims</u>	<u>Rejection</u>	<u>Cited Documents</u>
1, 3, 7-21 and 26-29	§ 102	Sugiarto
30-34	unclear ³	Sugiarto + Diwan
2	§ 103(a)	Sugiarto + Katariya
4-6 and 23-25	§ 103(a)	Szabo + Feinleib

/ / /

³ As noted above, this rejection is unclear. This summary assumes that Applicant's understanding is correct. By this summary, Applicant does not waive its request for clarification or of remedy as noted above.

The Claims

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites in part:

1. (previously presented) A method for customizing a structured markup language document and delivering said customized structured markup language document to an internet appliance, comprising:

* * * *

determining the internet appliance's geographical location from outside that internet appliance;

* * * *

including in said second document information that is specific to the location of said internet appliance.

Claim 1 includes elements recited in previous claims 9 and 11. These claims were each rejected on 35 U.S.C. § 102 grounds, as allegedly anticipated by **Sugiarto**, referring to col. 2, lines 8-11, and col. 6, lines 1-10.

Sugiarto does not show or suggest either determining the internet appliance's geographical location from outside that internet appliance, or including in that second document information that is specific to the location of said internet appliance.

Sugiarto col. 2, lines 8-11, as recited below, merely show

“configuring this information from various input sources, configuring this information in accordance with a predetermined user format, and transmitting the information to a remote location.”

Applicant is at a loss to identify where in this snippet of disclosure there is any indication of determining the internet appliance's geographical location from outside that internet appliance, or of including in that second document information that is specific to the location of said internet appliance. Rather, in accordance with known internet standards, **Sugiarto** need only determine a communication pathway to the internet appliance, not that internet appliance's geographical location.

Sugiarto col. 6, lines 1-10, as recited below, merely show

[FIG. 5 includes a web page editing screen 500, a bookmark listing 550, and a target screen 570. In web page editing screen 500, a user enters a website address in a URL portion 515, and then selects the submit button in order to access the website for use. This request is then transmitted from desktop computer system 9, through internet network 4 to system server 2 as shown in FIG. 1. System server 2 then retransmits this request back to internet network 4, and accesses the requested web page. In]² addition to identifying a web page at URL portion 515, a user may select a particular web page from bookmark section 550. Bookmark section 550 includes a plurality of bookmarks 555 set by a user at desktop computer system 9, a plurality of bookmarks 560 set by a user at handset 6, and a plurality of bookmarks set in accordance with system server 2 by the operator thereof. In order to select any of these websites, the user simply needs to select the appropriate bookmark, and the website will be automatically be accessed.

Applicant is again at a loss to identify where in this snippet of disclosure there is any indication of determining the internet appliance's geographical location from outside that internet appliance, or of including in that second document information that is specific to the location of said internet appliance. It is possible the Office was confused by the term "location",

² Included for context.

believing that term to refer to a location on the screen, rather than that internet appliance's geographical location.

No other cited document shows or suggests these elements of the claimed subject matter which are not shown in **Sugiarto**. Rather, it takes a strained reading of **Sugiarto** in the first place to even achieve a context in which these elements of the claimed subject matter might be identified in any other documents.

Accordingly, this recited text of claim 1 is not shown or suggested in **Sugiarto**, alone or in combination with any other cited documents.

Moreover, by relying on a set of identified bookmarks, **Sugiarto** teaches against identifying the geographical location of the internet appliance.

As the subject matter of claim 1 is neither shown nor suggested by **Sugiarto** or any other cited document, and is actually taught against by **Sugriarto**, claim 1 is allowable despite these cited documents. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102 rejection, and allowance of this claim.

Claims 2-8 and 11-16

Claims 2-8 and 11-16 depend from claim 1, and are therefore allowable for all reasons remarked upon with respect to claim 1.

Claim 21

Claim 21 recites in part:

a document manager associated with said management server for performing said document customization service ..., said document customization service capable of determining the internet appliance's geographical location from outside that internet appliance ...;

* * * *

capable of including in said customized web pages information that is specific to the location of said internet appliance.

As noted above, **Sugiarto** does not show or suggest, and actually teaches against, the recited subject matter of claim 21, or by any other cited document. As the subject matter of claim 21 is neither shown nor suggested by either **Sugiarto** or any other cited document, and is actually taught against by **Sugiarto**, claim 21 is allowable despite these cited documents. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102 rejection, and allowance of this claim.

Claims 23-26 and 28-34

Claims 23-26 and 28-34 depend from claim 21, and are therefore allowable for all reasons remarked upon with respect to claim 21.

/ / /

CONCLUSION

This Application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone Applicant's Assignee's attorney at (650) 947-0700, with any questions, or with any matter that might assist in bringing this Application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

April 27, 2009

/Steven A. Swernofsky/

Steven Swernofsky
Reg. No. 33,040